

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,263	11/19/2003		Joseph Ergun	79701 7723		
22242	7590	03/17/2006		EXAMINER		
		N AND FLAN	SAN MARTIN, EDGARDO			
120 SOUTH SUITE 1600		LE STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO,		3-3406		2837		

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				<i>}</i> }:	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Commence		10/717,263	ERGUN ET AL.		
Office Action Sum	imary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Edgardo San Martin	2837		
The MAILING DATE of thi Period for Reply	s communication app	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addres	SS	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FRO - Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dat - If NO period for reply is specified above, th - Failure to reply within the set or extended p Any reply received by the Office later than earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CF	DM THE MAILING D the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 te of this communication. e maximum statutory period period for reply will, by statute three months after the mailin	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC a, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this commuNABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication	ation(s) filed on <u>19 D</u>	ecember 2005.			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .		action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits				
closed in accordance with	the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5,7-12,14,1</u>	<i>5 and 17-20</i> is/are p	ending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdra	wn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allo					
6) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5,7-12,14,1</u>		ejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objection					
8) Claim(s) are subject	ct to restriction and/o	or election requirement.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected	•				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Applicant may not request th		- · · ·			
11) The oath or declaration is		•	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1		
	objected to by the L.	vairiller. Note the attache	ed Office Action of form F10-	102.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made	of a claim for foreigr	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ l					
·	•	ts have been received.			
<u> </u>	•	ts have been received in	· ·		
· ·		nty documents nave bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n received in this National Sta	ge	
* See the attached detailed C		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received.		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)			Summary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (f			o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-15)	2)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	10-14-001110/00/00/	6) Other: _			

Application/Control Number: 10/717,263 Page 2

Art Unit: 2837

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - The claim was amended by the Applicant on March 25, 2005, the changes were not present on the copy of the claims submitted in the communication filed on December 19, 2005.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims (1 and 11), (2 and 12), (4 and 14), (5 and 15), (7, 8,17 and 18), (9, 10, 19 and 20) are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 9, 14, 21, 22 and 10, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,624,605. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed subject matter presented in the current application is claimed in the U.S. Patent No. 6,624,605.

Response to Arguments

3. The Applicant established the common ownership of the current application and the patent to Powder et al. US 6,624,605, this situation has raised a Double Patenting issue as discussed above.

Conclusion

4. The attached hereto PTO Form 892 lists prior art made of record that the Examiner considered it pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edgardo San Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,263 Page 4

Art Unit: 2837

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext.33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edgardo San Martín Primary Examiner Art Unit 2837 Class 318

March 12, 2006